arXiv:1401.1118v1 [cond-mat.supr-con] 3 Jan 2014

Effect of SDW fluctuations on the specific heat jump in iron pnictides at a superconducting transition

D. Kuzmanovski,[1] A. Levchenko,[2] M. Khodas,[3] and M. G. Vavilov[1]

[1]*Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, USA*
[2]*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824, USA*
[3]*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242, USA*

(Dated: January 7, 2014)

Measurements of the specific heat jump at the onset of superconducting transition in the iron-pnictide compounds revealed strong variation of its magnitude as a function of doping that is peaked near the optimal doping. We show that this behavior is direct manifestation of the coexistence between spin-density-wave and superconducting orders and the peak originates from thermal fluctuations of the spin-density-waves near the end point of the coexistence phase – a tetracritical point. Thermal fluctuations result in a power-law dependence of the specific heat jump that is stronger than the contribution of mass renormalization due to quantum fluctuations of spin-density-waves in the vicinity of the putative critical point beneath the superconducting dome.

PACS numbers: 74.70.Xa, 74.25.Bt, 74.40.-n, 74.40.Kb

I. INTRODUCTION

The concept of quantum criticality is at the forefront of the physics of strongly correlated materials.[1] The discovered superconductivity in the iron-pnictide compounds[2–5] that emerges in the close proximity to magnetic instability[6–9] provides new opportunities to study quantum critical phenomena in the system with multiple order parameters. The observed microscopic coexistence between spin-density-wave (SDW) and superconducting (SC) orders in iron-pnictide superconductors (FeSC)[10–20] implies that SDW transition line extends into the superconducting state. If this line reaches zero temperature the system develops quantum critical point (QCP) beneath superconducting dome. Such a scenario is further complicated by the fact that besides the SDW transition, there is also a nematic transition, below which the tetragonal symmetry of the system is spontaneously broken down to an orthorhombic.[21–23] The transition line of the nematic order also enters the superconducting dome which may lead to yet another QCP. A magnetic QCP without superconductivity and in the case of nodal fermions in d-wave superconductors has been a subject of intensive study and is known to give rise to non-Fermi liquid behavior, and to singularities in various thermodynamic and transport characteristics.[24–27] The multi-band unconventional superconductivity in FeSC brings new intriguing questions concerning the role of QCP in thermodynamic and transport properties of correlated materials.[28–35]

Recently we have received compelling experimental evidence that superconductivity in FeSCs indeed hosts quantum criticality. Low temperature measurements of the doping dependence of the London penetration depth $\lambda(x)$ in clean samples of isovalent $BaFe_2(As_{1-x}P_x)_2$ revealed sharp peak in $\lambda(x)$ near the optimal doping $x_c \simeq 0.3$.[29] Magneto-oscillations data show an increase in effective mass $m^*(x)$ on one of the electron Fermi surfaces as x approaches x_c.[36] Nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) experiments show that the magnetic ordering temperature approaches zero at x_c.[37] Specific heat jump ΔC displays nonmonotonic dependence on x when measured across x_c at the superconducting critical temperature T_c.[31] Finally, the system obeys linear temperature dependence of the resistivity close to x_c.[38] Observation of the same set of features in the other families of FeSCs has been elusive so far since quantum critical effects are easily masked by inhomogeneity and impurity scattering. $BaFe_2(As_{1-x}P_x)_2$ is particularly useful in this regard since the substitution of As by the isovalent ion P does not change the electron/hole balance and does not induce appreciable scattering unlike in the electron-doped $Ba(Fe_{1-x}Co_x)_2As_2$ compound.[30]

Measurements of the magnitude and the doping dependence of the specific heat jump were instrumental for determining and understanding the phase diagram of iron–pnictide superconductors. Experiments[39–41] revealed that $\Delta C/T_c$ vary greatly between underdoped $Ba(Fe_{1-x}Ni_x)As_2$ and optimally hole-doped $Ba_{1-x}K_xFe_2As_2$, but even for the given material, e.g. $Ba(Fe_{1-x}Co_x)As_2$ or $BaFe_2(As_{1-x}P_x)_2$, the value of $\Delta C/T_c$ has its maximum near the optimal doping and then decreases, approximately as $\Delta C/T_c \propto T_c^2$ at smaller and larger dopings. It is useful to recall that in BCS theory specific heat jump $\Delta C/T_c = 4\pi^2 N_F/7\zeta(3)$ is universally determined by the total quasiparticle density of states N_F at the Fermi surface. The origin of the strong doping dependence of $\Delta C(x)$ was rooted[42] to the coexistence of SDW magnetism and $s^{\pm}$ superconductivity and the mean field theory is in general consistent with experimental observations. However, the sharply peaked and highly nonmonotonic variation of $\Delta C/T_c$ near x_c as seen in the experiment[31] is beyond the mean field treatment and is clearly related to fluctuation effects.

Combined accurate data analysis[29,31,36] on the magneto-oscillations, specific heat jump and magnetic penetration depth near the optimal doping lead to the

conjecture that the quasiparticle mass renormalization expected close to a QCP is the main factor which is causing the observed sharp features. Although this is certainly the case for the explanation of the low-temperature $\lambda(x)$ measurements, we take the point of view that interpretation of the $\Delta C(x)$ data obtained near the critical temperature requires an account of thermal fluctuations.

In this work, we find that thermal SDW fluctuations lead to a dominant contribution to the specific heat jump at the onset of superconducting transition that scales as a power law $\Delta C/T_c \propto |x-x_c|^{-\alpha}$. The value of the exponent $\alpha = 1 \div 3/2$ depends on whether SDW transition is commensurate or incommensurate. We recall that in the 122-family of iron-pnictides, and possibly in other FeSCs, optimal doping x_c nearly coincides with the end point of the coexistence region – a tetracritical point P. Once the system is tuned to the proximity of the tetracritical point both SDW and SC order parameters develop strong fluctuations. In the quantum case of $T = 0$, when the whole FS, except possibly for isolated hot points, is gapped by the non-zero SC order parameter $\Delta \neq 0$, fluctuation effects are reduced.[30] On the contrary, near $T = T_c$, the SC order parameter vanishes $\Delta = 0$, and SDW fluctuations are not suppressed, giving rise to large thermal corrections.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we introduce the minimal two-band model of FeSCs and discuss emergent phase diagram at the mean field level. In Sec. III we incorporate fluctuation effects and compute renormalized free energy of the system. In Sec. IV we use the latter to address the scaling of the specific heat jump near the tetracritical point and compare our calculations to the recent experimental findings. In Sec. V we summarize our main results and draw final conclusions.

II. MODEL OF FeSC AND PHASE DIAGRAM

We consider the minimal two-band low-energy model consisting of one circular hole pocket near the center of the Brillouin zone (BZ) and an electron pocket near its corner.[43,44] Away from the perfect nesting electron-like band can be parametrized as follows $\xi_e = -\xi_h + 2\delta_{\phi q}$, where hole band dispersion is assumed quadratic $\xi_h = \mu_h - p^2/2m_h$, with $\delta_{\phi q} = \delta_0 + \delta_2 \cos(2\phi) + (v_F q/2)\cos(\phi - \phi_0)$. The parameter $\delta_{\phi q}$ captures the relative shift in the Fermi energies, and difference in effective masses of the electron and hole bands, via δ_0, and an overall ellipticity of the electron band, via δ_2.[43] In addition, $\delta_{\phi q}$ also captures the incommensurability of the SDW order with vector $\boldsymbol{q}$, where ϕ and ϕ_0 are the directions of Fermi velocity $\boldsymbol{v}_F$ and $\boldsymbol{q}$ respectively. For isovalent doping (As $\to$ P) both δ_0 and δ_2 change, as the shape of the bands changes with doping x. Earlier calculations show[44] that there is a broad parameter range δ_2/δ_0 for which SDW order emerges gradually, and its appearance does not destroy SC order; i.e., SDW and SC orders coexist over some range of dopings. For simplicity, in our analysis we assume that only δ_0 changes, while the ellipticity parameter δ_2 is fixed, although the picture is expected to stay similar for different choices of dependence of (δ_0, δ_2) on doping. The incommensurability vector $\boldsymbol{q}$ is an adjustable parameter that minimizes the system free energy in the SDW phase or describes inhomogeneous SDW fluctuations in non-magnetic phases.

The basic Hamiltonian for electron-electron interaction includes the free fermion part, and four-fermion interaction terms. The interaction terms in the band basis are Hubbard, Hund, and pair-hopping interactions, dressed by coherence factors from the diagonalization of the quadratic form. There are five different interaction terms in the band basis:[46] two density-density intra-pocket interactions (these interactions are often treated as equal), density-density inter-pocket interaction, exchange inter-pocket interaction, and inter-pocket pair hopping. These five interactions can be rearranged into interactions in the particle-particle channel, and spin- and charge-density-wave particle-hole channels. For repulsive interactions, SDW and SC channels are the two most relevant ones. We decompose these four-fermion interactions by using SDW and SC order parameters $\boldsymbol{M}_q$ and Δ, and express corresponding couplings in terms of the bare transition temperatures T_{c0} to the SC state in the absence of SDW and T_{s0} to the perfectly nested FS in the absence of SC. Thus we arrive at the following free energy density:

$$\frac{\mathcal{F}(\Delta, \boldsymbol{M}_q)}{N_F} = \frac{\Delta^2}{2}\ln\left(\frac{T}{T_{c0}}\right) + \frac{|\boldsymbol{M}_q|^2}{2}\ln\left(\frac{T}{T_{s0}}\right)$$
$$-2\pi T\sum_{\varepsilon_n>0}\left[\mathrm{Re}\left\langle\sqrt{\mathcal{E}_n^2 + |\boldsymbol{M}_q|^2}\right\rangle_\phi - \varepsilon_n - \frac{\Delta^2 + |\boldsymbol{M}_q|^2}{2\varepsilon_n}\right], \quad (1)$$

where $\langle\ldots\rangle_\phi$ denotes averaging over ϕ along Fermi surfaces, $\mathcal{E}_n = E_n + i\delta_{\phi q}$, $E_n = \sqrt{\varepsilon_n^2 + \Delta^2}$, and $\varepsilon_n = \pi T(2n+1)$ are the fermionic Matsubara frequencies $(n = 0, \pm1, \pm2, \ldots)$. In Eq. (1) we allowed $\boldsymbol{M}_q$ to be a vector that has freedom in orientation as well as in the choice of the nesting vector q.

Transition temperatures from a normal phase to SDW or SC phases as well as from SDW to the coexistence phase as functions of δ_0 are depicted in upper panels of Fig. 1 and has been studied in the entire range of parameters.[44,45] One spurious property of the mean-field analysis when applied to the calculation of the specific heat jump is apparent discontinuity of ΔC occurring when the system enters the coexistence region, see lower panels of Fig. 1. The key point to emphasize here is that this singularity gets rounded up and transforms into a sharp peak once we include fluctuations of the SDW order in the paramagnetic phase. Indeed, thermodynamic fluctuations are nonzero on both sides of the tetracritical point, and the averages $\langle|\boldsymbol{M}_q^2|\rangle$ effectively renormalize the superconducting part of the free energy. Similar mechanism of enhancement of ΔC has been explored in the context of the heavy fermion superconductors $CeCoIn_5$ and UBe_{13}, which occurs due to the coupling of SC order parameter to fluctuating magnetization of the uncompensated part



FIG. 1: (Color online) Top: Phase diagram in $T - \delta_0$ plane for $\delta_2/(2\pi T_{s0}) = 0.2$ (panels a and b), and $\delta_2/(2\pi T_{s0}) = 0.0$ (panel c). A solid line on any diagram signals an SDW order parameter at a commensurate wave vector $\boldsymbol{Q} = \boldsymbol{\pi}$ (SDW$_0$), whereas a dashed line indicates incommensurate vector $\boldsymbol{Q} = \boldsymbol{\pi} + \boldsymbol{q}$ (SDW$_q$) as the dominant contributor. Red lines indicate a second order SDW-normal phase transition. Horizontal blue lines correspond to the SC-normal phase transition temperature, which is another free parameter of the theory. The green lines inside the SDW phase delimit the onset of SC from a pre-existing SDW ordered state, ending at the tetracritical point at optimal doping. Purple dotted lines indicate a first-order phase transition between either SDW$_0$-SC phase (panel a), or SDW$_0$-SDW$_q$ phase (panel c). Bottom: Behavior of $\Delta C/T_c$ as a function of δ_0 corresponding to the situation on the top diagram in the same vertical. At the mean field level ΔC is discontinuous at the tetracritical point and jumps back to the BCS value in the overdoped region, which is shown by the black solid horizontal line. The mean field behavior in the underdoped region depends on the choice of parameters and may diverge if the phase transition becomes first order (as in panel a). Fluctuations of the SDW order parameter smear the discontinuity as shown by the blue lines. Insets: Behavior of $\Gamma(\boldsymbol{q})$ as defined in Eq. (9) for the corresponding parameters, which determines the scaling behavior of the specific heat jump fluctuation correction.

of the localized f moments.[47] However, such scenario is not directly applicable to FeSCs since their magnetism is itinerant and spatial fluctuations of SDW order have long correlation length. Another important remark is that in our free energy, Eq. (1), we neglected gradient terms of SC order Δ since they give rise only to subleading corrections to ΔC. In other words, the region of fluctuations is narrower for SC order than for SDW order.

III. RENORMALIZED FREE ENERGY FROM SDW FLUCTUATIONS

To find an effective free energy functional $\mathcal{F}(\Delta)$ near the tetracritical point, we need to integrate out magnetic fluctuations $\boldsymbol{M}_q$ in Eq. (1). Overdoped case $x > x_c$ differs by the absence of the finite $\langle \boldsymbol{M}_q \rangle$ from the underdoped case $x < x_c$. However, as $\langle \boldsymbol{M}_q \rangle$ vanishes at the tetracritical point, we expect approximately the same results in both cases. According to the general picture of fluctuations near the second-order phase transition, we expect the same power-exponent scaling of ΔC versus $x - x_c$ for the underdoped and the overdoped regions of the phase diagram but with the different pre-factors.

Expanding Eq. (1) to the leading order in $|\boldsymbol{M}_q|^2$ and performing integration at the Gaussian level we find

$$\mathcal{F}(\Delta) = -T \ln \left[\int \mathcal{D}[\boldsymbol{M}_q] \exp(-\mathcal{F}(\Delta, \boldsymbol{M}_q)/T) \right] = \mathcal{F}_{\rm SC}(\Delta) + \delta\mathcal{F}_{\rm SDW}(\Delta). \quad (2)$$

The first term in the right-hand-side of Eq. (2) is simply superconducting part of the free energy which follows directly from Eq. (1) by setting $\boldsymbol{M}_q$ and $\delta_{\phi q}$ to zero,

which thus reads

$$\frac{\mathcal{F}_{\rm SC}(\Delta)}{N_F}=\frac{\Delta^2}{2}\ln\left(\frac{T}{T_{c0}}\right)-2\pi T\sum_{\varepsilon_n>0}\left[E_n-\varepsilon_n-\frac{\Delta^2}{2\varepsilon_n}\right]. \tag{3}$$

Being interested in the vicinity of the transition to the SC phase, where SC order parameter is small, we expand renormalized free energy $\mathcal{F}(\Delta)$ in powers of Δ. The leading order term $\mathcal{F}_{\rm SC}(\Delta)$ when expanded up to the forth order takes the usual form for the BCS theory

$$\frac{\mathcal{F}_{\rm SC}(\Delta)}{N_F}=A\Delta^2+\frac{B}{2}\Delta^4 \tag{4}$$

with the coefficients $A=(1/2)\ln(T/T_{c0})$ and $B=(\pi T/2)\sum_{\varepsilon_n>0}\varepsilon_n^{-3}=7\zeta(3)/16\pi^2T^2$. From the general thermodynamic relation $C=-T\partial_T^2\mathcal{F}$ we find from Eq. (4) that the jump of the specific heat at the SC transition is $\Delta C=N_FT_c[(\partial_TA)^2/B]_{T=T_c}$, which reproduces the BCS value $\Delta C/T_c=1.43(\pi^2/3)N_F$.

The second term in Eq. (2) is the correction to the free energy due to SDW fluctuations

$$\frac{\delta\mathcal{F}_{\rm SDW}(\Delta)}{N_F}=\frac{3T}{2N_F}\sum_q\ln\left(\frac{K_q(T,\Delta)}{K_q(T,0)}\right), \tag{5}$$

where

$$K_q(T,\Delta)=\ln\left(\frac{T}{T_{s0}}\right)-2\pi T\sum_{\varepsilon_n>0}\left[{\rm Re}\left\langle\frac{1}{\mathcal{E}_n}\right\rangle_\phi-\frac{1}{\varepsilon_n}\right]. \tag{6}$$

An expansion of the correction term Eq. (5) in powers of Δ

$$\frac{\delta\mathcal{F}_{\rm SDW}(\Delta)}{N_F}=\delta A\Delta^2+\frac{\delta B}{2}\Delta^4, \tag{7}$$

leads to the renormalization of the coefficients A and B in Eq. (4), that acquire corrections

$$\delta A=\frac{3T}{2N_F}\sum_q\frac{D_1}{\Gamma},\quad \delta B=\frac{3T}{2N_F}\sum_q\left(\frac{D_2}{\Gamma}-\frac{D_1^2}{\Gamma^2}\right). \tag{8}$$

The expressions that enter into Eq. (8) are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma&\equiv K_q(T,0)\\&=\ln\left(\frac{T}{T_{s0}}\right)-\psi\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)+{\rm Re}\left\langle\psi\left(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{i\delta_{\phi q}}{2\pi T}\right)\right\rangle_\phi,\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

$$D_1={\rm Re}\left\langle\frac{\psi\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)-\psi\left(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{i\delta_{\phi q}}{2\pi T}\right)}{2\delta_{\phi q}^2}\right\rangle_\phi-{\rm Im}\left\langle\frac{\psi^{[1]}\left(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{i\delta_{\phi q}}{2\pi T}\right)}{4\pi T\delta_{\phi q}}\right\rangle_\phi, \tag{10}$$

$$D_2=\frac{3}{4}{\rm Re}\left\langle\frac{\psi\left(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{i\delta_{\phi q}}{2\pi T}\right)-\psi\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)}{\delta_{\phi q}^4}\right\rangle_\phi-3{\rm Im}\left\langle\frac{\psi^{[1]}\left(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{i\delta_{\phi q}}{2\pi T}\right)}{8\pi T\delta_{\phi q}^3}\right\rangle_\phi$$

$$-{\rm Re}\left\langle\frac{2\psi^{[2]}\left(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{i\delta_{\phi q}}{2\pi T}\right)+\psi^{[2]}\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)}{32\pi^2T^2\delta_{\phi q}^2}\right\rangle_\phi, \tag{11}$$

where ψ and $\psi^{[n]}$ are the digamma and polygamma functions respectively. Terms representing fluctuation corrections in the free energy lead to the smearing of the discontinuity in the specific jump near the transition $\delta(\Delta C)/\Delta C=\delta T_c/T_c+2\partial_T\delta A/\partial_TA-\delta B/B$ with $\delta T_c=-2T_c\delta A(T_c)$. Computing temperature derivative of the δA and collecting all the terms together we obtain the following expression for the relative correction of the specific heat jump

$$\frac{\delta(\Delta C)}{\Delta C}=\frac{3T_c}{2N_F}\sum_q\left[\frac{1}{\Gamma^2}\left(\frac{16\pi^2T_c^2}{7\zeta(3)}D_1^2-4T_cD_1\partial_T\Gamma\right)+\frac{1}{\Gamma}\left(2D_1+4T_c\partial_TD_1-\frac{16\pi^2T_c^2}{7\zeta(3)}D_2\right)\right] \tag{12}$$

which constitutes the main result of this work. To study the most singular contribution to the specific heat jump correction in the vicinity of the tetracritical point, we note that a second-order transition to SDW phase is defined as the value of the detuning parameters for which the global minimum of Γ defined in Eq. (9) becomes equal to zero. Since Γ is in the denominator in Eq. (12), the most singular contribution comes from terms proportional to $1/\Gamma^2$.

IV. SCALING OF ΔC NEAR THE TETRACRITICAL POINT

Since the $\boldsymbol{q}$-dependence of any coefficient comes from $\delta_{\phi q}$, some general symmetries of the function $\Gamma(q_x,q_y;\delta_0,\delta_2)$ follow straightforwardly. First, Γ is symmetric in each q component separately, i.e. $\Gamma(q_x,q_y)=\Gamma(-q_x,q_y)=\Gamma(q_x,-q_y)$. Second, a change in the sign of δ_2 is equivalent to the exchange $q_x\leftrightarrow q_y$. We checked numerically that if there are any local minima of Γ at $(q_x,\pm q_y)$ for a non-zero q_y, then these minima merge as q_x increases until a value $q_x=q_0$, which in this case is the point of global minimum. To model such a behavior, it is convenient to expand Γ in Eq. (9) up to the fourth order in powers of $q_{x,y}$ in the following form

$$\begin{aligned}&\Gamma(q_x,q_y)\approx A_M\\&+\begin{pmatrix}|q_x^2-q_0^2|^m & |q_y^2|^n\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}u & v\\ v & w\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}|q_x^2-q_0^2|^m\\ |q_y^2|^n\end{pmatrix},\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

assuming that $u+w>0$, and $uw-v^2>0$, so that both of the eigenvalues of the matrix are positive, and Γ is bounded from below by A_M. The power exponents m and n are to be chosen so that there is a quadratic dispersion around the global minimum, unless there is a crossing from commensurate ($q_0=0$) to incommensurate ($q_0\neq0$) SDW order, in which case quartic terms are to be retained. In Eq. (13) $A_M=a_M\left(T-T_s(x)\right)$ near the

SDW-normal phase transition. The coefficient $a_M > 0$ is positive for temperatures higher than the transition temperature and $\Gamma > 0$. The tetracritical point is determined for doping x_c where the condition $T_s(x_c) = T_c$ is satisfied. This leads to $A_M \approx -a_M T_s'(x_c)(x - x_c)$. The derivative $T_s'(x_c) < 0$ is negative because doping leads to a decrease in the SDW transition temperature. Thus, the exponent in the scaling of the specific heat jump with A_M is the same as the exponent with $x - x_c$. We estimate the momentum integral in Eq. (12) by estimating the area S in the q-plane where

$$\left(\, |q_x^2 - q_0^2|^m \;\; |q_y^2|^n \, \right) \cdot \hat{M} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} |q_x^2 - q_0^2|^m \\ |q_y^2|^n \end{pmatrix} \leq A_M, \quad (14)$$

with

$$\hat{M} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} u & v \\ v & w \end{pmatrix}. \quad (15)$$

We diagonalize the matrix $\hat{M}$ by an orthogonal matrix

$$\hat{O} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta & -\sin\theta \\ \sin\theta & \cos\theta \end{pmatrix}, \quad (16)$$

so that $M \cdot \hat{O} = \hat{O} \cdot \hat{\Lambda}$, and $\hat{\Lambda} = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ is a diagonal matrix with positive eigenvalues. The angle θ is found from the condition

$$\tan 2\theta = \frac{2v}{u - w}, \quad (17)$$

and the eigenvalues are

$$\lambda_{1,2} = \frac{u + w}{2} \pm \sqrt{\left(\frac{u - w}{2}\right)^2 + v^2}. \quad (18)$$

If we introduce the substitution

$$|q_x^2 - q_0^2|^m = \rho \, A_M^{1/2} \left[\frac{\cos\theta \, \cos t}{\sqrt{\lambda_1}} - \frac{\sin\theta \, \sin t}{\sqrt{\lambda_2}} \right], \quad (19a)$$

$$|q_y^2|^n = \rho \, A_M^{1/2} \left[\frac{\sin\theta \, \cos t}{\sqrt{\lambda_1}} + \frac{\cos\theta \, \sin t}{\sqrt{\lambda_2}} \right], \quad (19b)$$

then the region where $\Gamma \approx A_M$ is delimited by $\rho \leq 1$. It is further convenient to introduce

$$\frac{\cos\theta}{\sqrt{\lambda_1}} = K_x \, \cos\alpha, \quad \frac{\sin\theta}{\sqrt{\lambda_2}} = K_x \, \sin\alpha, \quad (20a)$$

$$\frac{\cos\theta}{\sqrt{\lambda_2}} = K_y \, \cos\beta, \quad \frac{\sin\theta}{\sqrt{\lambda_1}} = K_y \, \sin\beta. \quad (20b)$$

Using the definitions of θ, and $\lambda_{1,2}$ from above, we obtain

$$K_{x,y}^2 = \frac{1}{u\,w - v^2} \begin{pmatrix} w \\ u \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sin(\alpha - \beta) = \frac{v}{\sqrt{uw}}. \quad (21)$$

Performing the final substitutions $t \to t - \alpha$, and $\beta \to -\beta + \alpha$, Eq. (19), for the first quadrant of the q-plane goes over to

$$q_x^{(1/2)} = \left[q_0^2 \pm \left(K_x \, \rho \, A_M^{1/2} \, \cos t \right)^{\frac{1}{m}} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (22a)$$

$$q_y = \left(K_y \, \rho \, A_M^{1/2} \, \sin(t - \beta) \right)^{\frac{1}{2n}}, \quad (22b)$$

where $\sin\beta$ should now stand for what was $\sin(\alpha - \beta)$, i.e.:

$$\sin\beta = \frac{v}{\sqrt{u\,w}}, \qquad -\frac{\pi}{2} < \beta < \frac{\pi}{2}. \quad (23)$$

The parameter t is limited by: $\beta \leq t \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$, unless $|q_0^2|^m < K_x \, A_M^{1/2} \cos\beta$. But, since we are concerned in the regime where $A_M \to 0^+$, this is only viable when $q_0 = 0$, in which case the branch $q_x^{(2)}$ does not exit. The area S of this region may be approximated by the area of a polygon for some specific values of the parameter t.

Case-1. When $|q_0^2|^m \gg K_x \, A_M^{1/2}$ the area is approximated by the area of the triangle with vertices at points obtained for points on the two branches $q_x^{(1/2)}$, $q_y = 0$, for $t = \beta$, and the point $q_x^{(1/2)} = q_0$, and q_y for $t = \pi/2$

$$S \approx \frac{2}{q_0} K_x^{\frac{1}{m}} \, K_y^{\frac{1}{2n}} \, \left(A_M \, \cos^2\beta \right)^{\frac{1}{2m} + \frac{1}{4n}}. \quad (24)$$

Case-2. If $q_0 \to 0^+$, then the area is approximately that of a right-angled triangle with sides equal to the q_x and q_y intercepts, obtained for $t = \beta$, and $t = \pi/2$, respectively

$$S_q \approx 2 K_x^{\frac{1}{2m}} \, K_y^{\frac{1}{2n}} \, \left(A_M \, \cos^2\beta \right)^{\frac{1}{4m} + \frac{1}{4n}}. \quad (25)$$

The behavior of the integral is then

$$\iint \frac{d^2q}{\Gamma^2(\boldsymbol{q})} \approx \frac{S}{A_M^2}. \quad (26)$$

There is one limiting situation that arises for the choice of parameter $\delta_2 = 0$. In that case Γ is independent on the azimuthal angle ϕ_0 of the wave vector $\boldsymbol{q}$. It only depends on the magnitude. Expanding Eq. (9) up to the leading order around the value $q = q_0$ for which the global minimum is obtained we get

$$\Gamma(q) \approx A_M + u \, |q^2 - q_0^2|^p \quad (27)$$

where power exponent p is equal to either 1 or 2, see table (I) for the summary. The integral is then easily evaluated in the polar coordinates $\iint \frac{d^2q}{\Gamma^2(\boldsymbol{q})} = \int_0^\infty \frac{2\pi \, q \, dq}{\Gamma^2(q)}$. Considering two limiting cases as above, namely $u|q_0|^{2p} \gg A_M$, and $q_0 \to 0^+$, one may show that the asymptotic behavior is as follows:

$$\iint \frac{d^2q}{\Gamma^2(\boldsymbol{q})} \approx \frac{c}{u^{1/p}} A_M^{1/p - 2}, \quad (28)$$



FIG. 2: (Color online) A log-log plot of the most singular specific heat jump fluctuation correction. The exponent varies between -1 and -2. The deviation from power law dependence for large values of τ is due to inessential band structure effects for the topic at hand.

and the difference between the two cases is only in the numerical prefactor $c = 2\pi$ and $c = \frac{\pi^2(p-1)}{p^2 \sin(\pi/p)}$, respectively. A summary of the scaling exponents is given in Table I.

Anisotropic

q_0	power law	exp.
incomm.	$\lvert q_x^2 - q_0^2\rvert^{2m},\ \lvert q_y^2\rvert^{2n}$	$-2 + \frac{1}{2m} + \frac{1}{4n}$
	$2m = 2,\ 2n = 1$	-1
comm.	$\lvert q_x^2\rvert^{2m},\ \lvert q_y^2\rvert^{2n}$	$-2 + \frac{1}{4m} + \frac{1}{4n}$
	$2m = 1,\ 2n = 1$	-1
	$2m = 2,\ 2n = 1$ or $2m = 1,\ 2n = 2$	$-5/4$

Isotropic

q_0	power law	exp.
incomm.	$\lvert q^2 - q_0^2\rvert^p$	$-2 + \frac{1}{p}$
	$p = 2$	$-3/2$
comm.	$\lvert q^2\rvert^p$	$-2 + \frac{1}{p}$
	$p = 1$	-1

TABLE I: Typical exponents for the scaling behavior of the most singular fluctuation correction for the specific heat jump. "incomm." denotes that the global minimum is realized for $q_0 \neq 0$, while "comm." that it is for $q_0 = 0$.

Having above analytical arguments, we evaluate correction to the specific heat jump numerically and present our results in Fig. 2 on a log-log plot for the same choice of parameters as in Fig. 1. A useful dimensionless parameter that characterizes the deviation from the tetracritical point, and one that is customarily chosen is

$$\tau \equiv \frac{T_c - T_s^*(\delta_0)}{T_c}. \tag{29}$$

Here $T_s^*(\delta_0) = T_s(\delta_{0c}) + T_s'(\delta_{0c})(\delta_0 - \delta_{0c})$ is the linearized SDW transition temperature dependent on the isotropic detuning parameter δ_0 near the tetracritical point, defined as $T_s(\delta_{0c}) = T_c$. We use the linearized temperature dependence in order to cancel any additional power law scaling coming from the nonlinear dependence. Assuming that δ_0 is a linear function of x, this enables us to study scaling in terms of experimentally measurable $x - x_c$. In this way, we obtain the following numerical law

$$\frac{\delta(\Delta C)_{\text{sing.}}}{\Delta C} = \kappa\, F\left(\tau, \delta_2, \frac{T_{c0}}{T_{s0}}\right), \tag{30}$$

where κ is a dimensionless combination of several constants characterizing the system

$$\kappa = \frac{6}{\pi^2}\frac{T_{c0}}{N_F\, v_F^2} = \frac{3}{2\pi}\frac{T_{c0}}{T_F}. \tag{31}$$

In the last step, we used the fact that for a parabolic dispersion in 2-D, $N_F\, v_F^2 = 2bT_F/\pi$, where b is the number of FS pockets (in our case $b = 2$.) This prefactor plays the role of a small parameter in our approximation scheme. When $\kappa F \sim 1$, the contribution to the specific heat jump from fluctuations becomes comparable to the mean field contribution, indicating that the logarithmic derivative approximation to derive the correction Eq. (12) becomes inapplicable. The fact that the ratio T_{c0}/T_F takes a numerical value of the order of 10^{-2} in the iron-pnictide compounds, limits the validity of the correction to lower values of τ in the region of $0.05 - 0.5$, while effects of details in the band structure certainly become prominent when $\tau \sim 1$.

If one performs a similar analysis for the sub-dominant term in Eq. (12), one would naturally obtain a correction that scales logarithmically $\propto \ln(x - x_c)$ for the most typical q-dependence of Γ. Since our analysis dealt with an effective action for the two order parameters from the very beginning, we interpret this correction as arising due to the SDW fluctuation correction of the two-point correlator of the SC order parameter. Drawing skeleton diagrams with explicit appearance of fermion lines and SC-fermion interaction vertices, and "dressing them" with SDW fluctuations, one sees that, aside from the self-energy (mass) renormalization of the fermions, there are also vertex-correction contributions. Furthermore, there are contributions from the four-point SC correlator that involve even more complicated constructs in terms of language of fermions and our analysis captures all these effects.



FIG. 3: The size of the jump in the specific heat as a function of doping. Points with error bars represent experimental data of Ref. 31. The solid line shows a combined fit that includes a contribution from fluctuations of SDW order. The left three points correspond to underdoped samples and are not taken into account for fitting curves.

V. COMPARISON TO EXPERIMENT

We perform a weighted least-squares fit, including the combined errors in $\Delta C/T_c$, as well as x, of the model

$$\frac{\Delta C}{T_c} = \alpha + \beta \, \ln(x - x_c) + \gamma \, (x - x_c)^{-1}, \qquad (32)$$

to data from recent experiment of Walmsley *et al.*[31], using ten points for overdoped samples, as shown in Fig. 3. Eq. (32) incorporates a constant (BCS), and a logarithmically dependent ("QCP") term, as well as the most generic power-law dependence $(x - x_c)^{-1}$ found in the cases enumerated in Table I. The critical doping $x_c = 0.3$ corresponds to the optimally doped sample, and is held fixed. The fit gave the following values

$$\alpha = -14.4, \quad \beta = -16.9, \quad \gamma = 1.7, \qquad (33)$$

with a reduced chi-squred $\chi^2_\nu = 0.91$ for $\nu = 10 - 3 = 7$ degrees of freedom. From these numerical values, one can conclude that the power-law contribution is larger than the logarithmic term for doping $x_c < x < x_c + 0.03$.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have studied doping dependence of the specific heat jump in FeSCs based on a minimal two-band model of electron band structure. We have found that beyond the mean field level the discontinuity of $\Delta C/T_c$ at the tetracritical point (the end point of the coexistence phase) transforms into the sharp maximum. As a result, $\Delta C/T_c$ drops for deviations from $T_c(x_c) = T_s(x_c)$ both into the coexistence phase and away from the SDW region. Still, the decrease of $\Delta C/T_c$ should be more rapid within the SDW-ordered phase. In the vicinity of the optimal doping x_c the scaling of $\Delta C/T_c$ versus $x - x_c$ is governed by the two main effects. The first is logarithmic quasiparticle mass renormalization which stems from the quantum critical fluctuations beneath superconducting dome.[30,33,34] The second is the effect of thermal fluctuations of the SDW order. Our numerical fitting procedure to the data of Ref. 31 suggests the significant importance of the thermal SDW fluctuations on the magnitude of the specific heat jump at the transition to the SC phase.

Acknowledgments

We thank A. Chubukov, Y. Matsuda and T. Shibauchi for discussions. We are especially grateful to A. Carrington for numerous discussions, for reading the manuscript, and for providing us with experimental data, which enabled us to perform the comparison presented in Fig. 3. A.L. acknowledges support from NSF under Grant No. PHYS-1066293 and the hospitality of the Aspen Center for Physics where part of this work was performed. M.K. acknowledges support from University of Iowa. D.K and M.V. were supported by NSF Grant No. DMR 0955500.

[1] S. Sachdev, *Quantum phase transitions*, (Cambridge University Press, 2011).
[2] Y. Kamihara, T. Watanabe, M. Hirano, and H. Hosono, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **130**, 3296 (2008).
[3] X. H. Chen, T. Wu, G. Wu, R. H. Liu, H. Chen, and D. F. Fang, Nature (London) **453**, 761 (2008).
[4] G. F. Chen, Z. Li, D. Wu, G. Li, W. Z. Hu, J. Dong, P. Zheng, J. L. Luo, and N. L. Wang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 247002 (2008).
[5] M. Rotter, M. Tegel, and D. Johrendt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 107006 (2008).
[6] H. Luetkens, H.-H. Klauss, M. Kraken, F. J. Litterst, T. Dellmann, R. Klingeler, C. Hess, R. Khasanov, A. Amato, C. Baines, M. Kosmala, O. J. Schumann, M. Braden, J. Hamann-Borrero, N. Leps, A. Kondrat, G. Behr, J. Werner, and B. Büchner, Nature Mater. **8**, 305 (2009).

[7] A. J. Drew, Ch. Niedermayer, P. J. Baker, F. L. Pratt, S. J. Blundell, T. Lancaster, R. H. Liu, G. Wu, X. H. Chen, I. Watanabe, V. K. Malik, A. Dubroka, M. Rössle, K. W. Kim, C. Baines, and C. Bernhard, Nature Mater. **8**, 310 (2009).

[8] N. Ni, M. E. Tillman, J.-Q. Yan, A. Kracher, S. T. Hannahs, S. L. Bud'ko, and P. C. Canfield, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 214515 (2008).

[9] J.-H. Chu, J. G. Analytis, C. Kucharczyk, and I. R. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 014506 (2009).

[10] N. Ni, M. E. Tillman, J.-Q. Yan, A. Kracher, S. T. Hannahs, S. L. Bud'ko, and P. C. Canfield, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 214515 (2008).

[11] J.-H. Chu, J. G. Analytis, C. Kucharczyk, and I. R. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 014506 (2009).

[12] Y. Laplace, J. Bobroff, F. Rullier-Albenque, D. Colson, and A. Forget, Phys. Rev. B **80**, 140501(R) (2009).

[13] M.-H. Julien, H. Mayaffre, M. Horvatic, C. Berthier, X. D. Zhang, W. Wu, G. F. Chen, N. L. Wang, and J. L. Luo, EPL **87**, 37001 (2009).

[14] C. Bernhard, A. J. Drew, L. Schulz, V. K. Malik, M. Rossle, C. Niedermayer, T. Wolf, G. D. Varma, G. Mu, H. H. Wen, H. Liu, G. Wu, and X. H. Chen, New J. Phys. **11**, 055050 (2009).

[15] F. Ning, K. Ahilan, T. Imai, A. S. Sefat, R. Jin, M. A. McGuire, B. C. Sales, and D. Mandrus, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **78**, 013711 (2009).

[16] C. Lester, J.-H. Chu, J. G. Analytis, S. C. Capelli, A. S. Erickson, C. L. Condron, M. F. Toney, I. R. Fisher, and S. M. Hayden, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 144523 (2009).

[17] D. K. Pratt, W. Tian, A. Kreyssig, J. L. Zarestky, S. Nandi, N. Ni, S. L. Bud'ko, P. C. Canfield, A. I. Goldman, and R. J. McQueeney, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 087001 (2009).

[18] H. Chen, Y. Ren, Y. Qiu, W. Bao, R. H. Liu, G. Wu, T. Wu, Y. L. Xie, X. F. Wang, Q. Huang, and X. H. Chen, EPL **85**, 17006 (2009).

[19] M. Rotter, M. Tegel, I. Schellenberg, F. M. Schappacher, R. Pöttgen, J. Deisenhofer, A. Günther, F. Schrettle, A. Loidl, and D. Johrendt, New J. Phys. **11**, 025014 (2009).

[20] Z. Li, R. Zhou, Y. Liu, D. L. Sun, J. Yang, C. T. Lin, and Guo-qing Zheng, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 180501(R) (2012).

[21] R. M. Fernandes, A. V. Chubukov, J. Knolle, I. Eremin, and J. Schmalian, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 024534 (2012).

[22] I. R. Fisher, L. Degiorgi, and Z. X. Shen, Rep. Prog. Phys. **74**, 124506 (2011)

[23] S. Kasahara, H. J. Shi, K. Hashimoto, S. Tonegawa, Y. Mizukami, T. Shibauchi, K. Sugimoto, T. Fukuda, T. Terashima, A. H. Nevidomskyy, and Y. Matsuda, Nature **486**, 382 (2012).

[24] A. Abanov, A. V. Chubukov, and J. Schmalian, Adv. Phys. **52**, 119 (2003).

[25] M. A. Metlitski and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 075128 (2010).

[26] A. Pelissetto, S. Sachdev, and E. Vicari, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 027005 (2008).

[27] K. B. Efetov, H. Meier, and C. Pépin, Nat. Phys. **9**, 442 (2013).

[28] T. Shibauchi, A. Carrington, and Y. Matsuda, preprint arXiv:1304.6387.

[29] K. Hashimoto, K. Cho, T. Shibauchi, S. Kasahara, Y. Mizukami, R. Katsumata, Y. Tsuruhara, T. Terashima, H. Ikeda, M. A. Tanatar, H. Kitano, N. Salovich, R. W. Giannetta, P. Walmsley, A. Carrington, R. Prozorov, Y. Matsuda, Science **336**, 1554 (2012).

[30] A. Levchenko, M. G. Vavilov, M. Khodas, A. V. Chubukov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 177003 (2013).

[31] P. Walmsley, C. Putzke, L. Malone, I. Guillamon, D. Vignolles, C. Proust, S. Badoux, A. I. Coldea, M. D. Watson, S. Kasahara, Y. Mizukami, T. Shibauchi, Y. Matsuda, and A. Carrington Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 257002 (2013).

[32] R. Zhou, Z. Li, J. Yang, D. L. Sun, C. T. Lin, and G.-Q Zheng, Nat. Comm. **4**, 2265 (2013).

[33] D. Chowdhury, B. Swingle, E. Berg, S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 157004 (2013).

[34] T. Nomoto and H. Ikeda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 167001 (2013).

[35] R. M. Fernandes, S. Maiti, P. Wölfle, A. V. Chubukov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 057001 (2013).

[36] H. Shishido, A. F. Bangura, A. I. Coldea, S. Tonegawa, K. Hashimoto, S. Kasahara, P. M. C. Rourke, H. Ikeda, T. Terashima, R. Settai, Y. Onuki, D. Vignolles, C. Proust, B. Vignolle, A. McCollam, Y. Matsuda, T. Shibauchi, and A. Carrington, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 057008 (2010).

[37] Y. Nakai, T. Iye, S. Kitagawa, K. Ishida, H. Ikeda, S. Kasahara, H. Shishido, T. Shibauchi, Y. Matsuda, and T. Terashima, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 107003 (2010).

[38] S. Kasahara, T. Shibauchi, K. Hashimoto, K. Ikada, S. Tonegawa, R. Okazaki, H. Shishido, H. Ikeda, H. Takeya, K. Hirata, T. Terashima, and Y. Matsuda, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 184519 (2010).

[39] S. L. Bud'ko, N. Ni, and P. C. Canfield, Phys. Rev. B **79**, 220516 (2009).

[40] Z. S. Wang, H-Q. Luo, C. Ren, and H.-H. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 140501 (2008); N. Ni, S. L. Budko, A. Kreyssig, S. Nandi, G. E. Rustan, A. I. Goldman, S. Gupta, J. D. Corbett, A. Kracher, and P. C. Canfield, *ibid.* **78**, 014507 (2008); G. Mu, H. Luo, Z. Wang, L. Shan, C. Ren, and H.-H. Wen, *ibid.* **79**, 174501 (2009); P. Popovich, A. V. Boris, O. V. Dolgov, A. A. Golubov, D. L. Sun, C. T. Lin, R. K. Kremer, and B. Keimer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 027003 (2010); J. S. Kim, G. R. Stewart, S. Kasahara, T. Shibauchi, T. Terashima, and Y. Matsuda, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter **23**, 222201 (2011).

[41] F. Hardy, T. Wolf, R. A. Fisher, R. Eder, P. Schweiss, P. Adelmann, H. v. Löhneysen, and C. Meingast, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 060501(R) (2010); F. Hardy, P. Burger, T. Wolf, R. A. Fisher, P. Schweiss, P. Adelmann, R. Heid, R. Fromknecht, R. Eder, D. Ernst, H. v. Löhneysen, and C. Meingast, Europhys. Lett. **91**, 47008 (2010).

[42] M. G. Vavilov, A. V. Chubukov, and A. B. Vorontsov, Phys. Rev. B **84**, 140502(R) (2011); M. G. Vavilov and A. V. Chubukov, *ibid.* **84**, 214521 (2011).

[43] M. G. Vavilov, A. V. Chubukov, and A. B. Vorontsov Supercond. Sci. Technol. **23**, 054011 (2010).

[44] A. B. Vorontsov, M. G. Vavilov, and A. V. Chubukov Phys. Rev. B **81**, 174538 (2010); R. M. Fernandes and J. Schmalian *ibid.* **82**, 014521 (2010).

[45] We note that the SDW-normal phase transition curve in Figs. 1a, b differs from the one in Ref. 44 [see their Fig. 5], while Fig. 1c is identical. The reason for this is that in the presence of anisotropic detuning, there is partial compensation of the detrimental effects of anisotropy and incommensurability for the survival of the SDW phase, extending the SDW_q phase above the critical value $\delta_{0c} = e^{-\gamma_E}/2 = 0.2807$ valid in the case when either $\delta_2 = 0$, or $q = 0$.

[46] A. V. Chubukov, D. V. Efremov, and I. Eremin, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 134512 (2008).

[47] S. Kos, I. Martin, and C. M. Varma, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 052507 (2003).